



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lists of successive years were not written on separate lines but followed each other without spacing, and therefore might be read in different ways. For instance, for the year 350 AUC we find in the *Fasti Capitolini* and Diodorus the names arranged in this order: P. Cornelius, Cn. Cornelius, Fabius, Nautius, Valerius, Sergius; while in Livy the last two precede the others. This Costa regards as evidence that the original read thus—

- |                 |                  |            |             |
|-----------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 1. P. Cornelius | 2. Cn. Cornelius | 3. Fabius  | 4. Nautius  |
|                 |                  | 6. Sergius | 5. Valerius |

and that this original reading was copied in different ways. This is a simple case compared with some, but each apparent exception furnishes another opportunity for an ingenious combination.

This boustrophedonic method, therefore, having been proved for the lists of military tribunes, must be applied to the entire *fasti* of the earlier period, and, in the author's opinion, it is this that was the ultimate cause of variation between the two subsequent traditions, the chronographic and annalistic. In an appendix we have a table which represents Costa's idea of the appearance of the original *fasti* from 330 to 387 AUC. Much that he says is plausible, but the theory is pushed too far, and the superstructure topples of its own weight.

S. B. P.

---

*A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis.* By JOHN S. McINTOSH.  
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912. Pp. x+130.  
75 cents net.

This dissertation, after a few introductory pages which review various theories of the origin and nature of the Old Latin Bible, selects for especial attention the Book of Genesis as it is known from quotations in the works of Augustine. The study falls into three main divisions: (1) a reconstruction of the text; (2) an analysis of the varying forms of the quotations found in different places in Augustine's writings; and (3) a consideration of the Latinity of the Old Latin Genesis.

In the first part Dr. McIntosh follows wherever available the modern editions of Dombart, Knöll, and the editors of the Vienna *Corpus*; elsewhere, ignoring the work of the Benedictines of St. Maur, he follows the text of its reprint by Migne. The quotations collected are printed continuously on pp. 13-43, but the list of passages from which they are taken is inconveniently deferred to pp. 125-30. Tested by a random examination of the *indices locorum* of several volumes of the Vienna *Corpus* and a hasty search through a few hundred pages in various volumes of Migne's edition, the collection of quotations appears fairly exhaustive. There should be added to it, however, Gen. 6:22 (found in *Retract.* 2, 80, and apparently noted by McIntosh himself later, on p. 49), and Gen. 10:1 (found, in part, in *De civ.* 16, 3). In Gen. 17:3 the proper reading is *suam* not *tuam*.

For chaps. 1-3 we are happily able to compare nearly complete versions in Augustine's two works, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* and *De Genesi ad litteram*, and again in chap. 1 these two with a third very full version from *De Genesi imperfectus liber*. These texts have been printed in parallel columns. Yet it is unfortunate that both in these chapters and elsewhere the author does not attempt to cite every passage in Augustine in which a given quotation appears, but merely gives every variant found. For the value of full testimonia is not to be despised, especially in cases of doubt as to whether Augustine is quoting freely or verbatim. The collection of variant readings (pp. 43-57) attempts at first to give not only variants in different works by Augustine but also variants in the MSS of a single work. Since, however, the latter readings are very vaguely cited as those of "some MSS," little is gained by this sort of precision, and it is at once discarded.<sup>1</sup> To the list of variants additions might be made, for example: 3:5; cf. *Con. Iul.* 5, 17; 3:18; cf. *Con. Iul.* 1, 17; 3:24; cf. *Retract.* 2, 50; in 6:7 the best reading of *Retract.* 1, 26 is not identical with that cited from *De Trin.* 1, 1; 6:9; cf. *De civ.* 16, 12; 22:18 is indeed often quoted in the form noted on p. 54, but sometimes also with the omission of *terrae*.

Much of the detailed analysis on pp. 58-65, with its classification of differences in the quotations, appears to the reviewer to prove little save that variants vary, but the view maintained in the following pages that Augustine used different texts of Genesis at different times, that, as a whole, his earlier works employ a freer and his later works a more literally translated version, and that the points of likeness between these different versions are so many and striking that they must be derived from the same original translation seems not improbable.

In his third section Dr. McIntosh discusses the Latinity of the Old Latin Genesis under the headings of Word Formation and Inflection (following Cooper's *Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*), Vocabulary, Syntax, and Style, and concludes that for the peculiarities found in the work the influence of Greek (and of Hebrew through the LXX) is responsible in much larger degree than is the Vulgar Latin, and that of the latter too little occurs to enable one to point with any certainty to the country in which the Old Latin translation was made.

A considerable number of misprints have been noted, and a few inadvertences apparently not due to the printer, e.g., p. 1, Sabatier's work "was published at Remis"; p. 44, "In Epist. Ioannem"; p. 47, "in Speculum Mark"; on p. 89, n. 1, the citation of Servius should be made directly rather than through the medium of Lindsay's *Latin Language*.

The author contemplates, as he announces on pp. 10 and 79, an enlargement of his work, to include a study of the Old Latin Genesis as quoted by other Latin Fathers. If this can be made with greater consideration of the

<sup>1</sup> A similar indefiniteness in stating the worth of MS variants is found on p. 70, ll. 10 ff.

textual variations involved and with more complete citations of all sources than the present work contains it should be a useful contribution to our knowledge of one of the most perplexing fields in Latin philological study.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

---

*Companion to Roman History.* By H. STUART JONES. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Pp. xii+472. \$5.00.

The purpose of this book, a companion volume to Barnard's *Companion to English History*, is to treat those subjects that can be illustrated from material remains. The introductory chapter is devoted to a discussion of the earliest settlements of the Italians, the development of their town and land systems, including the city of Rome, and roads and sea routes. Then follow chapters on architecture, war, religion, production and distribution, money, public amusements, and art. Each section is provided with a short bibliography; and there are seven maps, eighty plates, sixty-four cuts, and the necessary indexes. Footnotes are admitted, but not in such numbers as to be burdensome. The bibliographies do not pretend to be exhaustive, but are in general quite up to date and ample, the only striking omission noted being that of Narducci, *Sulla Fognatura della Città di Roma*, Rome, 1889, from the list of works on p. 154 that deal with the drainage system of the city. The illustrations are excellent and well selected.

Immediate comparison is suggested between this book and Sandys' *Companion to Latin Studies*, which covers a far wider field, contains almost twice as many pages, and costs only a dollar more. All the topics treated by Stuart Jones are also treated in Sandys' book, but in less detail. Excluding the chapter on architecture, the space devoted to other topics by Stuart Jones is nearly twice that given by Sandys, while the former's chapter on architecture is five times as long as the latter's. The most striking difference between the two books is that Sandys' is the work of several scholars, while the other is entirely the work of one. In the nature of the case it must be largely a compilation, and the author acknowledges his obligations, but the book has the advantage of possessing unity of plan and method.

To undertake alone so comprehensive a work in these days of collaboration demands a considerable degree of self-confidence, and a willingness to expose oneself to criticism from many sides, but so far as the reviewer is able to judge the author has done his work remarkably well. There are of course statements that may be challenged, but the author will usually be found to have good reasons for his own views, or to be relying on recognized authorities. Even in those fields farthest removed from art and architecture, where he speaks as a master, the result is eminently satisfactory, and the book is characterized by a clearness and directness of statement that leaves little